

closer to alleviating the fears and threats to prospective witnesses and help safeguard our communities from violence. The time has come for us to show our commitment to our constituents and the justice system because, without witnesses, there can simply be no justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1845

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, there is no other issue more central to the core responsibility of government than the duty to protect the safety and security of the American people. The right not to be killed is foundational to all other rights. The actions we take with respect to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, better known as FISA, will reflect the level of seriousness with which we have assumed this fundamental obligation.

While I take a backseat to no one when it comes to the protection of civil liberties, it is essential to understand the proper context of the issue by us.

Mr. Speaker, the focus of the debate here relates to overseas intelligence, the implications for the privacy rights of Americans, talked about so loudly on the floor last week by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the implications for privacy rights of Americans where surveillance targets of non-U.S. persons overseas is minimal to nonexistent.

This debate over FISA must not be morphed into an ideological crusade by those who have such a visceral dislike for President Bush that any perceived defeat for this administration is in some perverse way chalked up as a victory. The debate is not about President Bush; it is about protecting the lives of those who have sent us here to represent them.

And it is serious business. In my estimation, this is perhaps the most important issue that we will face here in the 110th Congress.

It has been my privilege to serve on both the Homeland Security and Judiciary Committees. It is my belief that we have made progress in protecting the homeland since 9/11. Under the leadership of both parties on the Homeland Security Committee, there have been disagreements about the particu-

lars, but there has always been a bipartisan commitment to moving the ball forward to make our Nation safer.

To be brutally honest, we cannot rely on the prospect of getting it right every time someone might seek to come here to kill innocent Americans. The idea of having to construct a perfect defense in and of itself is not conceivable. However, this is where the role of intelligence comes into primary focus.

Developing a homeland security strategy must not be considered in isolation. Intelligence collection overseas is the crucial element in any strategy to secure the homeland. Otherwise, we fall prey to what I refer to as the Maginot syndrome. You remember the Maginot line. That is where the French learned a terrible lesson concerning the folly of relying on the idea that they could protect themselves with a focus on massive defense perimeter. Much more is required and, again, intelligence collection targeting non-U.S. persons can extend our homeland defense perimeter overseas.

Brian Jenkins of the RAND Corporation, a noted expert on terrorism, has stressed that our intelligence capability is a key element in our effort to protect our homeland. As he says, in the terror attacks since 9/11 we've seen combinations of local conspiracies inspired by, assisted by, and guided by al Qaeda's central leadership. It is essential that while protecting the basic rights of American citizens we find ways to facilitate the collection and exchange of intelligence across national and bureaucratic borders.

So how do we make sense out of what is taking place in this House with respect to our consideration of FISA, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act? Foreign intelligence surveillance, I'd like to underscore.

The manner in which we address this crucial national security question is a clear measure of our level of seriousness about the threat posed to our Nation from another terrorist attack. The bottom line question to be asked is whether or not we are safer as a result of the action taken by this House concerning the collection of overseas intelligence.

As in the game of football, you're either advancing the ball or you are losing yardage. Does our action make America safer or does it impose obstacles in the path of the intelligence community which make their job more difficult? In making this determination, I would suggest that the line of scrimmage should be drawn with the Protect America Act. That is the act we passed in early August, on a bipartisan basis, responding to the request of Admiral McConnell, the Director of National Intelligence.

We should understand that that act represented a compromise reflecting what Admiral McConnell, the Director of National Intelligence, identified as absolutely necessary, absolutely necessary to the task of protecting the